

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

I. Telephone Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Maples for all of the courtesies extended in the telephone interviews held on January 9, 2004 and March 23, 2004.

II. Acknowledgement of Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the acknowledgment of allowable subject matter in claims 29-33, 35-41, 48, 49, and 51-56.

III. Restriction Requirement and Status of the Claims

The Examiner has required restriction among the following groups:

Group 1, claims 29-41, 48-56, drawn to a first cell unit/method of producing; or

Group II, claims 42-47, drawn to a second cell unit.

During a telephone conversation with the Examiner on January 9, 2004, a provisional election was made with traverse by Applicants to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 29-41, 48-56. Affirmation of this election with traverse is hereby made by Applicants.

Claims 29-58 are pending in this application.

Claims 42-47 directed to the non-elected group have been cancelled.

Claims 29-33, 35-41, 48, 49 and 51-56 have been allowed.

Claims 34 and 50 have been rejected for informal matters. Applicants respectfully state that claims 34 and 50 have been amended to address the informalities indicated by the Examiner.

New claims 57 and 58, depending from claims 34 and 50 respectively, have been added. These new claims do not add new matter. Support for these new claims can be found in original claims 34 and 50, the drawings (e.g., Fig. 4a-4e), as well as in the Specification at pp. 13-14 which provides that the one or more cells can be connected at each of multiple sides of a circuit board.

IV. Objections to the Drawings

The drawings have been objected to as failing to show cells connected at the same edges of the circuit board as set forth in both claims 25 and 41 [sic 34 and 50]. As discussed in the telephone interviews with the Examiner on January 9, 2004 and March 23, 2004 and agreed to by the Examiner, the references in the January 20, 2004 Office Action to claims 25 and 41, both with respect to the objection to the drawings and with respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are typographical errors and should actually read claims 34 and 50.

In the telephone interview with the Examiner on March 23, 2004, Applicants noted and the Examiner agreed that cells connected at the same edges of the circuit board as set forth in claims 34 and 50 are shown in the drawings (e.g., Fig. 4a, which shows two unconnected cells 1 and 1ⁱ at the right side of circuit board 5 and two cells 1ⁱⁱ and 1ⁱⁱⁱ connected to the left side of circuit board 5) and the Specification at pp. 13-14 which provides that one or more cells may be connected at each of one or more sides of the circuit board.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 41 [sic 34 and 50] have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite as a result of the recitation of the term “optionally.” Claims 34 and 50 have been amended to delete reference to the term “optionally” as well as all claim language following the term. For this reason, claims 34 and 50 are now submitted as allowable and Applicants respectfully request that the above rejection be withdrawn.

Therefore, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance as to all pending claims be issued in this case.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Erin M. Buder

Evan M. Budis
Reg. No. 46,587
Attorney for Applicants

DARBY & DARBY, P.C.
Post Office Box 5257
New York, N.Y. 10150-5257
Phone (212) 527-7700